

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-10 and rejected same. This paper requests entry of an amendment to claims 1 and 10. It is believed that the amendment is merely responsive to a rejection based on a formality, and thus should be entered.

Rejections for statutory double patenting

At section 2 of the Office action, claims 1-10 are rejected for non-statutory double patenting. With this paper a terminal disclaimer believed sufficient to overcome the rejection is filed.

Rejections under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph

The Office rejects the claims because claims 1 and 6 for being indefinite. With this paper claims 1 and 6 are changed in a way believed to overcome the grounds for rejection. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC section 112, first paragraph

The Office rejects the claims because claims 1 and 6 are asserted to have been amended in a way not supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully submits that at page 13, line 20, the application explains:

A last remark is that, although the data symbols in the above described network segment are transported over a telephone line TL, the applicability of the present invention is not restricted by the transmission medium via which the data are transported. In particular, on any connection between two communicating units, TX and RX, e.g. a cable connection, an optical connection, a satellite connection, a radio link through the air, and so on, the present invention may be realized. [Emphasis added.]

Applicant respectfully submits that anyone skilled in the art of telecommunications would view this as reasonably conveying that the

inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the invention as in amended claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC section 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.


4 June 2006

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON LLP

755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234

Cust. No.: 004955